



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,749	01/28/2005	Junichi Shimizu	0033-0978PUS1	8747
2292 7590 05/13/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER NICKERSON, JEFFREY L.				
ART UNIT 2142		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/13/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/522,749 filed on nationally on 28 January 2005 and internationally on 16 February 2004. The after-final amendment presented on 25 April 2008, which proposes change to claims 1, 4, 8, 9, and 10, and the abstract, is hereby acknowledged.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 25 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 USC 103 based on the combined teachings of Yoneyama (US 2003/0064707), Moody (2003/0167310), Andros (US 4817194), and Chung (US 2002/0063738).

Applicant argues that the limitation **searching for an email already stored in the device's mail storage** is not disclosed. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Yoneyama, paragraph [0013] specifically states, "the **message search means searches for past e-mail messages** related to the currently-displayed received message based on the key word stored in the storage means, **[and] extracts a retrieved e-mail message...**" It is clear from the context of the paragraph that Yoneyama is extracting the email message from storage, thereby providing the emails are stored in storage.

Applicant argues that Yoneyama does not disclose **mail storage storing a plurality of emails**. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Yoneyama, paragraphs such as [0018]-[0019], which describe the user flipping back and forth between past received emails (plural), provide that these email messages are stored on the device.

Applicant argues that the limitation **arranging in time sequence each of said plurality of emails based on a transmission time of sent email or a reception time of received email**. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figures 5a and 5b clearly show that the emails are arranged in a time sequence based on either transmission (sent) time or reception (received) time, and in [0006] Yoneyama states that chronological sorting is well known in the art. Paragraph [0055] provides the dates are actual representations of the received/transmission date. The applicant further argues that a date is not the same as a time. The examiner further disagrees, as dates are a measurement and indication of time. This is evidenced by American Heritage Dictionary's definition of the term "date", as follows: "Time stated in terms of the day, month, and year."

*date. (n.d.). The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Retrieved May 07, 2008, from Dictionary.com website:
<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/date>*

Art Unit: 2142

Applicant argues that the limitation **a mail search portion searches said plurality of emails, and generates index data for arranging in time sequence**. The examiner respectfully disagrees. See arguments above for arranging in time sequence and searching. Yoneyama doesn't explicitly teach generating index data, though it could be argued that it is impossible to chronologically order an array of items without having index data, and therefore inherent. Moody, cures this deficiency in paragraphs [0093]-[0100], where he extracts and generates indexing (categorizing) data (one of which happens to be date information) from emails, and then arranges the emails for presentation based on this index data in paragraphs [0109]-[0113].

Applicant argues rejection of claims 8-17 based on similar arguments. The examiner respectfully disagrees for reasons similar to those stated above.

Any arguments not addressed are about limitations which are either added by amendment or arguing features not found in the claim language. Therefore, all rejections are hereby maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./
Jeffrey Nickerson
Examiner, Art Unit 2142

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142